

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A first species restriction regards different embodiments of the casing and the profile clamp in Figs. 1-4:

Species I: Fig. 1;

Species II: Fig. 2;

Species III: Fig. 3;

Species IV: Fig. 4.

A second species restriction regards different embodiments of the corner region of the casing including abutting profile clamp ends in Figs. 5-7:

Species A: Fig. 5;

Species B: Fig. 6;

Species C: Fig. 7.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species (one of Species I-IV and one of Species A-C) for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant selects Species 2 and Species C for initial examination.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The claims readable on species 2 and species C are believed to be:

1-6, 8, 10-19 and 21-23
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly

admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant does not traverse the election of species requirement.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The claims readable on species 2 and species C are believed to be:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23.

Applicants submit that the prior art made of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious the present invention.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should not be able to find a certain element of Applicants' claims in a search of the state of the art and such element is deemed by the Examiner to be necessary for forming a basis for a rejection, then the Examiner is invited to inform the Applicants of such element in order to allow the Applicants to fully meet their disclosure requirement in view of innumerable and hypothetical possibilities of combining references to allege obviousness of individual claims. In particular, in view of different levels of familiarity of inventors with the information disclosure requirements of the United States Patent and Trademark Office developed in recent years and apparently still developing, which disclosure requirements are believed to be unique in the world, any help and suggestions regarding possible problems seen by the Examiner are welcome.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Reinhold Barlian et al.

By: 

Horst M. Kasper, their attorney
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.(908)757-2839 Tel.(908)668-5262
Reg.No. 28559; Docket No.: BAR207

(rep-